

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,935	06/27/2003	Nicholas Grant Rasmussen	20567-023001	6976
20985 FISH & RICH	7590 08/06/2008 ARDSON, PC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 102	22	GUILL, RUSSELL L		
MINNEAPOL	IS, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2123	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/608,935	RASMUSSEN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Russ Guill	2123		

	Russ Guill	2123				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ul>	of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	appeal. Since a			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
<ol> <li>∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> <li>(a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further or</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown)</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);				
appeal; and/or	orrognonding number of finally rais	noted alaims				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: Please refer to the Request for Reconside.						
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			PTOL-324)			
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		The state of the s				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13.  Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					

/Paul L Rodriguez/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

First, the Examiner would like to thank the Applicant for the fully responsive and well prepared response.

While the claim amendments appear to overcome the prior art of record, an updated search is required to determine if further art applies to the claims. The Examiner remarks that claim 1 appears to have a minor typographical condition in line 11, which recites, "to form one or a symmetric". Further, especially since the response does not appear to recite support in the specification for the claim amendments, additional consideration is needed to ensure compliance under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Further, a valid process under 35 USC § 101 must either 1) transform underlying subject matter, or 2) be ide to another statutory class, such as a particular apparatus. In order to qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recile the other statutory class to which it is ited, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps. A mere nominal recitation of a computer in the first limitation of claim 1 does not appear sufficient to tell the process to a particular apparatus; not just any inclusion of a machine makes a method a statutory process. Please refer to the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, ex parte Langemyr, appeal 2008-1495. For at least these reasons, the application is not in condition for allowance...